United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit



APPENDIX

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEA FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

United States of America,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

Carlos Cuadrado, Robert Munoz, James Sims,

Defendants-Appellants.

DEFENDANT-APPELLANT CUADRADO'S APPENDIX

Respectfully submitted,

MANUEL NELSON ZAPATA
Attorney for DefendantAppellant Cuadrado
277 Broadway
New York, New York 10007



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Transcript of Cuadrado's Plea of Guilty on January 17, 1975	. 1-11
Defendant Cuadrado's Motion, Dated January 2, 1976, for an Order to Have Hon. Constance B. Motley Voluntarily Disqualify Herself From Any Further Proceedings in	
His Case	12-16
Transcript of Sentence of Defendant Cuadrado on January 23, 1976	17-33

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BY THE COURT:

1 elmch UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CARLOS CUADRADO Before: HON. CONSTANCE BAKER MOTLEY, District Judge. New York, New York - January 17, 1975, 9:30 a.m. For the Government: KENNETH FEINBERG, Esq. For the Defendant: NELSON ZAPATA, Egg. (Case called) MR. FEINBERG: The Government is ready. MR. ZAPATA: The defendants is ready. Your Honor, this defendant wishes permission to withdraw the plea of not guilty previously entered to this indictment, 74 Criminal 1168, and offers to plead

Mr. Cuadrado, is this your signature on the petition

guilty to the crime of conspiracy contained in Count 1 of

that indictment in satisfaction of the whole indictment.

Do you feel that any of your Constitutional rights

1972 up to and including the date of the filing of the indictment, which was December 11, 1974, here in the Southern District of New York, which shows that you are in fact guilty of conspiring with others to extort money from contractors.

A Actually, we had meetings -- this is an organization we had meetings in this area, there were discussions in those meetings regarding how to go about to do these things to obtain this money. I have signed checks for monies paid to other persons; even though I never went to put any bomb on this place, I counsel, we talk, we argue regarding these bombs, and this is why I felt that I am guilty of conspiracy. It's the only reason I felt that, because I conspire, I work with them, the other persons involved in this case, and we talk about it.

- Q And you agreed with them to use bombs to extort money; is that it?
 - A Yes, I agree, but I never went to the place.
- Q That is what I am asking you. You are charged with agreeing at this point.
 - A That is what it is; I agreed.
- Q Do you have any questions you would like to ask your attorney or the Court at this time before I finally accept the plea of guilty?

MR. ZAPATA: Your Honor, may I make an application in connection with the bail? This defendant has a \$1,000 cash bail posted and he is in dire need of this money. He has faithfully appeared in court voluntarily, he was never arrested, and cooperated fully all the times that he has been required to appear to speak to the Assistant District Attorney or to appear before the Court, so I would ask your Honor to fix a \$1,000 personal recognizance bond unsecured,

21

22

23

24

SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT REPORTERS, U.S. COURTHOUSE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indictment # 74 Cr.1010

ROBERT MUNOZ, JOHN SIMS,

JAMES SIMS, FRANK SIMS, CARLOS

CUADRADO, CLEO WILLIAMS, a/k/a

Brother Black, a/k/a Cleo Black,
and WARNELL VEGA, a/k/a "Skip"

Vega, EDDIE JACKSON, PRUTO ALICEA,

Defendants.

SIR:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that upon the annexed affidavit of MANUEL NELSON ZAPATA, attorney for the Defendant CARLOS CUADRADO, duly sworn to the 2nd day of January, 1976, and upon all the pleadings and proceedings heretofore had herein, the undersigned will move this Court before Hon. Constance B. Motley on the 16 th day of January, 1976, at the Courthouse, Foley Square, New York, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon of that day, or as counsel can be heard, for an order to have the Hon. Constance B. Motley voluntarily disqualify herself from sitting on further proceedings involving Defendant CARLOS CUADRADO and for such other and further relief as to this Court may seem just and proper.

Dated: New York, New York January 2, 1976

Yours, etc.

TO: Thomas J. Eahill
U.S. Attorney for
the Southern District
Foley Square

Attorney for Defendant 277 Broadway New York, New York 10007

MANUEL NELSON ZAPATA

New York, New York

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indictment # 74 Cr.1010

ROBERT MUNOZ, JOHN SIMS,
JAMES SIMS, FRANK SIMS, CARLOS
CUADRADO, CLEO WILLIAMS, a/k/a
Brother Black, a/k/a Cleo Black,
and WARNELL VEGA, a/k/a "Skip"
Vega, EDDIE JACKSON, FRUTO ALICEA,

Defendants.

STATE OF NEW YORK)

COUNTY OF NEW YORK)

MANUEL NELSON ZAPATA, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

- I am the attorney for the Defendant CARLOS
 CUADRADO, and fully familiar with the facts and circumstances of this case.
- 2. This Defendant was indicted and charged with one count of conspiracy in that he violated Title 18 U.S.E., Section 371, 8 counts of a violation of Title 18 U.S.C., Section 844 (i) and 2, 20 counts of violation of Title 18 U.S.C., Section 1951 (a) and 2, and one count of a violation of Title 18 U.S.C., Section 1503 and 2.
- 3. On December 20, 1974, the Defendant pleaded not guilty to the indictment. Thereafter, he entered a plea before Hon. Constance B. Motley on January 17, 1975, to count one of the indictment, which is a violation of Title 18 U.S.C., Section 371. The Defendant is scheduled to be sentenced on January 23, 1976.
 - 4. The Defendant CUADRADO has fully cooperated with

the government in the prosecution of this case. He tratified before the grand jury on October 10, 1974 and has willingly and voluntarily given information to the U.S. Attorney handling this matter. He has also testified in the trial of this in itement at which the Hon. Constance B. Motley presided as the trial judge.

5. The Court in its charge to the jury characterized the testimony of the defendant Cuadrado as follows:

In my view, the testimony of the witness Carlos Cuadrado is completely incredible, that is, unbelievable, and should not be accorded any weight; but, as I noted before, you are not bound to accept my view of his testimony and must arrive at your own decision as to whether his testimony is to be accorded any weight and whether you believe his testimony or not. (page 6400 of trial transcript hereto annexed as an exhibit.)

- 6. Is is respectfully suggested to this Court that the above statement indicates bias and prejudice toward the Defendant Cuadrado and would make it exceedingly difficult for this court to sit as a fair and just tribunal in any further proceedings involving this Defendant. The interests of justice seem to require the voluntary withdrawal of this Court in order that both the reality and appearance of justice and impartiality can be preserved. It is vital to the continued viability of our democratic system that that the court system not only be fair but it must also appear to be fair.
- 7. It is respectfully suggested to this Court that it voluntarily withdraw from further proceedings with respect to the Defendant Cuadrado to avoid the appearance of a possibility of personal bias and prejudice to him.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully requested that this Court voluntarily withdraw from further proceedings in the case involving the Defendant Cuadrado.

Duly sworn to: the 2nd day of January, 1976

MANUEL NELSON ZAPATA

MELVIN E. ROSENTHAL
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 30-8659331
Qualified in Nassau County
Certificate filed in New York County
Commission Expires March 30, 12224

committed perjury, as he understands it, when testifying as to these matters.

If you believe a witness has been impeached and discredited, you may give the testimony of that witness such credibility or no credibility as you see Sit.

Carlos Cuadrado is completely incredible, that is, unbaliavable, and should not be accorded any weight; but,
as I noted before, you are not bound to accept my view of
his testimony and must arrive at your own decision as to
whether his testimony is to be accorded any weight and
whather you baliave his testimony or not.

The law does not compel a defendant in a criminal case to take the witness stand and testify, and no presumption of guilt may be raised and no inference of any kind may be drawn, from the failure of a defendant to testify.

However, a defendant who wishes to testify may do so and is a competent witness. The defendant's testimony is to be judged in the same way as that of any other witness.

Some defendants have not taken the stand. The test that a defendant, who has a right so to do, has not taken the stand and testified in this case does not create any presumption against hir and cannot be considered by you

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE CLERK: The United States versus Cuadrado.

MR. HARRIS: Government ready.

MR. ZAPATA: Ready.

THE COURT: Mr. Zapata, at this time the Court will give you an opportunity to say anything you wish on behalf of the defendant Carlos Cuadrado, after which the Court will address the defendant separately.

MR. ZAPATA: Thank you.

Your Honor, first I want to explain why the sentence memorandum which I sent you is inaccurate, incomplete as to the prior riminal record of this defendant.

THE COURT: Do you have that down here, Mr. Clerk?

MR. ZAPATA: I have a copy, if you need one.

THE COURT: Yes. Would you hand it up?

MR. ZAPATA: Sure (handing).

of his criminal record, and he did. Mr. Rosenthal of my office spoke to him. Then, that same day, the memorandum was prepared and mailed. Then Mr. Cuadrado called Mr. Rosenthal and told him that the defendant had been convicted as a youth of other crimes in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Rosenthal did not communicate this to me until last night. Otherwise I would have written a letter

to supplement the memorandum, your Honor, and there was no intention on the part of anyone to mislead the Court or to conceal anything that this defendant has committed.

Your Honor is, I am sure, as familiar with this case as anyone could humanly be. You've heard this defendant testify in this case; you have a probation report, which should clearly show the defendant's background and the facts of his case.

Just to emphasize, this defendant from the beginning decided to cooperate with the Government, the prosecution in this case, and in my opinion, at least when I was present, he spoke to Mr. Feinberg, who was then the Assistant U. S. Attorney in charge of the matter, and the defendant spoke frankly at that time. This is my opinion; I could be wrong, but Mr. Feinberg was satisfied that the defendant had spoken openly and frankly to him.

Then the defendant went to the grand jury and Mr. Feinberg explained to me that the defendant had given critical testimony that had opened leads, etc., that helped in the prosecution of the case.

Your Honor heard the testimony of this defendant in court and had assessed him, and I would not have any quarrel with that because I wasn't here and obviously you are in a better position than I am to evaluate such testimony.

_

Now, one thing is clear: that this defendant while out on bail has continued to work and support his family, his child with a lady who is his common law wife and, I understand, I've been informed, the children that she had by a previous marriage.

He is fully aware, and so am I, that your Honor could impose anywhere from one day to five years imprisonment on him, and I in no way intend to minimize the seriousness of his acts, but I would say that if this man is incarcerated, the greater punishment will not go to him but will go to his wife and child and her children.

They will end up, without any question, as charges of the City of New York. They will have to be supported by society through its system called social welfare, be stigmatized, perhaps be ashamed later when they grow up and learn that not only did the father go to jail but that they had to go on welfare.

Now, I ask your Honor to weigh the damage that will be done to this woman and her children against the good it would do to put Mr. Cuadrado in jail. Undoubtedly some good would be done by incarcerating a man, as an element of deterrence against others and a deterrence against this individual, but it seems to me that without trying to embellish his life, because it is not a pretty one,

but who am I to judge him? I also live in a glass house, as most of us.

He works. He is an industrious individual.

He has some good in him. If he were thoroughly rotten,

obviously he would not support a wife and child and would

not work, especially the work that he does. He helps

others who are even more unfortunate, less fortunate than

he is, people who have been drug addicts who are trying to

find a direction in life.

As your Honor knows, he is working with an organization that has done a magnificent job in the Bronx in rehabilitating people who are ready to be buried alive spiritually. So that in that regard he also shows a desire to help others and shows that there is some good in this individual.

ual an opportunity. If your Honor were to place him on probation and impose the maximum sentence on him, that would be hanging over him to an extent that, if he failed in any way to comply with the terms of probation, he would be brought back here and be sent away for that period of time, and I don't think anybody would have any quarrel with that. I would not and I don't think this defendant would, because to some extent he is a reasonable individual.

•

^

I ask for leniency on his behalf, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the Government have anything to say?

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, Mr. Cuadrado agreed to cooperate with the Government and testify at trial, and he did so testify. It was a long trial and your Honor heard his testimony and car weigh its impact with regard to the entire case and where it fits in, and whatever assessment is possible to make of it your Honor is in a position to make, having seen and heard it.

THE COURT: Mr. Cuadrado, you are now before the Court for sentence, having been convicted on your plea of guilty to Count One of Indictment 74 Crim. 1168, which charged you with a violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.

Now, for this offense the law provides a term of imprisonment of up to five years and/or a fine of up to \$10,000.

Do you wish to make a statement in your own behalf at this time or to say anything as to why these maximum penalties provided by the law should not be imposed in your case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor, as I recall, I born poor. My father died when I was eight,

7 8

and at the age of ten I started selling newspaper to support my mother. At the age of thirteen I started joining other boys, other people. I became what you call, what anybody call, a trash. I commit a whole lot of crimes and a whole lot of bag things in my life.

not mine. One is mine. That's the only child I ever had.

I work to support her, support my kids. They are in school. They call me father. I feel proud of that.

I know that in 1969 I did commit a crime. I was placed on probation, which I did, working and supporting. When I was on probation, I decided to help the less fortunate that come from prison, and I started to get a job for people who were on parole, probation.

I place around a hundred of those people in meaningful jobs, which today most of them are working.

In November, 1974 I was laid off from my job.

I was wondering where I could work. I went to a construction site and I worked for two weeks. I came back. Mr.

Munoz offered me a job for \$8,000, which I turned down three times. But I didn't had no money, nothing to support my wife or my kids. I decided to take it.

Since that time I've been working in there and
I have placed about 198 drug addicts who have committed

offenses, crimes, who are on parole, on probation. They
reside there. I've sent them, counseled them. They have
been going to high school. Some of them, they are still
going to college and working.

I know I did bag, but now I'm trying to do my best and help somebody else. If I go to jail, as a man, if I commit offense, I can be punished for that. But how about her and my kids? Those are the ones which I care for a whole lot. Those are the ones who can make me think twice before I can put my feet against the law again.

That's the only thing I have to say, your Honor.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, just one thing. We have not been provided with a copy of Mr. Zapata's memorandum. So our silence with regard to it doesn't indicate agreement with anything in there since we haven't seen it.

THE COURT: Well, with respect to that, as Mr. Zapata has pointed out, that memorandum misrepresents the facts with respect to Mr. Cuadrado's prior criminal record. It points out that the defendant has three previous convictions, all involving possession of a weapon.

It says that in 1969, in the Bronx Supreme

Court he pleaded guilty to possession of a weapon as a

felony and was placed on probation for five years. That

was the incident that he testified to, I believe, in the

1

jg

3

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

trial of this case, involving a police officer's attempt to arrest him and the weapon he had in his possession went off.

Then the presentence report says in 1948, in Rio Pedros, Puerto Rico, he pleaded quilty to a violation of the Sullivan law and attempted murder and was sentenced to four years imprisonment and to one to ten years imprisonment, whereas the facts are that Mr. Cuadrado has an extensive criminal record, going back to 1940, most of which were minor offenses, apparently in Puerto Rico, such as breach of the peace, gambling, assault and battery.

But he also has other covictions for carrying a weapon, one in May of '41 for which he received 45 days, one for aggravated assault and battery in '41, for which he received ninety days, another for carrying of a weapon in '43, one month; carrying a weapon in '44, one month.

He was covicted of sodomy and rape and sentenced to prison in 1948 for one to ten years -- excuse me, that was June of '49; another carrying a weapon in '48, three months; he was sentenced in 1952, apparently, to one to ten years for attempt to kill, carrying a weapon, an unregistered firearn.

Mr. Cuadrado, did you serve a term for attempting to kill of one to two years in 1952?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: One to ten years? That was in addition to the one to ten years you received for rape and sodomy in 1949?

THE DEFENDANT: Those sentences run concurrently, your Honor.

THE COURT: The ran concurrently?

THE DEFENDANT: Those sentences were run concurrently.

THE COURT: How much time did you actually serve in prison?

THE DEFENDANT: I served four years in Atlanta.

I came back from Atlanta and I served six years -- four more years in Puerto Rico. I served eight years all together.

I came on parole from Puerto Rico to New York, and since I came here I've been working, until 1969, that I have that case in the Bronx -- since that time I've been working -- and this case here, your Honor.

THE COURT: And, of course, that involved another gun charge, didn't it, in the Bronx?

Apparently, at the time of the trial, Mr. Harris, the Government didn't have this information about his prior covictions. They run on for two pages here, or three pages.

MR. HARRIS: That's correct, your Honor. The

information we had, which was turned over to defense counsel, was Mr. Cuadrado's; BI, which is known as his rap sheet, his prior record, and I don't have in front of me, but it certainly did not indicate some of what your Honor has recited today.

THE COURT: Well, as I've said, the majority are for minor crimes, apparently, for which he received small fines. But he does have a couple of major convictions that he has just attested to, two ten year sentences, one to ten anyway.

In addition to the sentence in the Bronx, he apparently was placed on probation in the Bronx, because they didn't have all this about your background, did they, Mr. Cuadrado, at the time of your sentence in the Bronx and placed on probation? Did the Judge have all these convictions before him at that time?

THE DEFENDANT: I think he did.

THE COURT: You think he did?

THE DEFENDANT: I think they have. The probation officer told me at that time that they my record.

THE COURT: That was in 1969 in the Bronx. You were sentenced on May 5, 1970 to five years probation. It is your statement that they had these charges from Puerto Rico?

THE DEFENDANT: That's what the probation say.

I think they send -- I don't know if they had them or not,
your Honor.

THE COURT: You don't know, is that it?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not too sure if they had.

But, as far as I say, my attorney Oscar Conzalez Suarez, at that time he explained it to me that they have my record, they send for it in Puerto Rico, and they had it. And my probation told me so, too.

of five years probation for possession of a weapon, you had five prior covictions for possession of a weapon, isn't that so?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: At least five.

THE DEFENDANT: In puerto Rico, a little blade that you shave, they call at that time -- they can try you for transporting a weapon, in Puerto Rico at that time, your Honor, a small blade, something like that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, it is referred to here as carrying a deadly weapon. You say that was a small blade, not a gun?

THE DEFENDANT: I was sentenced for a gun a few times.

 THE COURT: And, of course, during the trial you testified for the Government, and you recall that I suggested to the jury that in my view your testimony was not beleivable. Do you recall that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Mr. Zapata explained that to me about a week ago, that he called me to his office.

Am I right?

MR. ZAPATA: Yes.

THE COURT: And I see that the U. S. Attorney,
Mr. Harris, according to the probation officer, characerized
your cooperation on the stand as ludicrous.

MR. HARRIS: That is inaccurate, your Honor.

I believe that I never said that.

THE COURT: On page 10 of the probation report the Probation Officer says the following: "Assistant United States Attorney Jeffrey Harris, Southern District of New York, indicated that the defendant's cooperation on the stand was ludicrous."

I guess you didn't use those words as indicated.

"He felt that his cooperation was a sham and that Cuadrado, a friend of lobert Munoz, tailored his testi-mony accordingly."

Did you say that in substance to the Probation Officer?

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, with respect to Munoz,
I said words to that effect, mainly to the effect that
based on his friendship with Munoz and based on the other
evidence the Government had, that with regard to his statements that Munoz had no knowledge of any of these acts,
bombings or was privy to any discussions, I did feel that
that testimony was a sham, yes. I did say that.

THE COURT: All right.

It is the judgment of the Court that the defendant be sentenced to a term of five years. That is in view of your extensive criminal record, Mr. Cuadrado.

And, as far as the cooperation with the Government, we've just gone over that.

So that the Court can't agree that you gave any cooperation to the Government that was worth anything in this case.

It also appears, as I indicated, that you were given a suspended sentence in the Bronx without that Court having the benefit of your extensive criminal record in Puerto Rico.

MR. ZAPATA: Your Honor, may I speak on that?

I was not his attorney at the time, but I'm

familiar with cases in the Bronx and in the whole City of

New York. I've represented many clients in the Bronx who

took a plea and were convicted.

from Puerto Rico. They either get them through the FBI or they write directly to the Department of Justice in Puerto Rico and get them.

You would have to go into the actual background of the case to see why the District Attorney felt and the Court felt that this was a proper sentence. This is what I think happened in this case, that there were mitigating circumstances.

THE COURT: I don't know what happened, but it just impressed me that the Court probably didn't have that, because the presentence report reiterates the fact that these Puerto Rican convictions did not appear on his FBI rap sheet, as it is called.

So the chances are they didn't have that in the Bronx when he was sentenced in 1970. The Probation Officer and the Government here has said that they didn't have it -- is that so? -- when he testified for the Government?

MR. HARRIS: That is so, your Honor.

MR. ZAPATA: I have had many defendants who took pleas in the Bronx or were convicted whose records were incomplete, and they obtained --

THE COURT: But aside from that, the defendant is sentenced to five years because, as I've indicated, he has an extensive criminal record which involves carrying a weapon. He has admitted to carrying a gun in addition to a knife, and he was previously convicted in the Bronx of having a gun which went off in a struggle, and he has served time before for major crimes.

His cooperation with the Government was nil in this case and --

MR. ZAPATA: I take issue with that, your Honor.

And the Government should have stated frankly and candidly
the cooperation the Government had. Mr. Feinberg made a
commitment and this man went before the grand jury and
opened himself completely and this should have been stated
without any equivocation. Your Honor should know that.

Now, what happened in the courtroom is something else. But this man cooperated. Mr. Feinberg told me that this man had given him information that without which he could not build this case the way they did.

Now the Government has made a statement which is not candid and is equivocating. In fairness to this man, especially the Government of the United States should stand up to its commitment.

I don't think that we can have a proper adminis-

tration of justice, respect for the law if the Government itself doesn't stand up and do what it is supposed to do.

THE COURT: Are there open counts, Mr. Harris?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, your Honor. The Government has no objection to dismissal of the open counts.

THE COURT: All right. Do you want to move to dismiss the open counts?

MR. ZAPATA: I so move, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The defendant is remanded.